REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

In the disclosed preferred embodiment of the invention, a slit 48 is formed between two shutter elements (identified as 44, 46 in Fig. 5, and as 62, 64 in Fig. 6). The slit has a length and a width, the width being shorter than the length. The shutter elements include respective tapered surfaces 72, 74 which cooperate with respective tapered surfaces formed by walls 68, 70 of a guide mechanism such that when sliding movement occurs between the tapered surface 72 of the shutter 62 and the tapered surface of the respective wall 68, and between the tapered surface 74 of the other shutter element 64 and the tapered surface of the respective wall 70, the spacing between the shutter elements 62, 64 changes, thereby varying the width of the slit.

Claim 26 recites, inter alia:

- the first and second shutter elements including respective first and second tapered surfaces and respective first and second slit-forming surfaces, the slit width being shorter than the slit length,

- a guide mechanism comprising first and second tapered surfaces arranged to cooperate with the first and second tapered surfaces of the shutter elements, and

- a drive mechanism arranged to produce sliding movement between the cooperating tapered surfaces to

cause the slit-forming surfaces to move relative to one another in the direction of the slit's width to vary the dimension of that width.

Claim 26 stands rejected over Scheid who discloses a slit 56 having a length and a width, the length shown as extending in a left-right direction in Fig. 5, and the width shown as extending in an up-down direction. The length of the slit can be adjusted by attenuators 120L, 120R. In contrast, claim 26 recites that the width of the slit (i.e., the shorter dimension of the slit) is varied. In Scheid et al. the slit width stays constant during the length adjustment and no means is provided for varying the width.

Moreover, the width of Scheid's slit is not defined by a distance between slit forming surfaces that are relatively movable as recited in claim 26.

Also, there occurs no sliding movement between tapered surfaces in Scheid since the attenuators 120L, 120R are moved linearly by respective rack/pinion couplings 122, 124. In contrast, claim 26 recites sliding movement between tapered surfaces to effect the width adjustment

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 26 distinguishes patentably over Scheid and that claim 26 and claims 27-31, which depend from claim 26, are allowable. The dependent claims recite further advantageous features of the invention. Claim 27 recites that the sliding movements associated with both shutter elements are produced by a single motor, wherein the shutter elements move co-centrically with respect to a center line of the slit. In contrast, Scheid employs separate motors for driving the attenuators 120L, 120R, so the attenuators are susceptible to variations in their respective movements, and it cannot be guaranteed that an optimum umbra

to penumbra ratio of the imaging beam on the detector will be achieved as recited in claim 27.

Claim 29 recites a motor, a reduction drive connected to the motor, and a mechanism connected to the reduction drive and arranged to impart linear motion to both of the shutter elements to effect the sliding movements. As noted above, Scheid employs separate motors for moving the attenuators.

Claim 31 recites that the shutter elements are biased towards one another and are caused to move away from one another, against the bias, by the drive mechanism. No such bias is employed in Scheid.

Claims 26, 27 and 31 have been amended to overcome the objections raised in section no. 2 of the Official Action.

In light of the foregoing amendments and comments it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 5, 2008

By: _____
Alan E. Kopecki
Registration No. 28,813

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620